

Serial No. 09/935,699
Docket No. T36-135964M/KOH

7

REMARKS

Applicant notes that in the Office Action dated May 18, 2004, the Examiner alleged that the response filed herein on October 30, 2003 was not responsive to the Office Action dated July 30, 2003. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and therefore presents claims 1-20 again for examination by the Examiner. Applicant herein incorporates the arguments of Applicant which were included in the Response filed herein on March 2, 2004.

Applicant further notes that the Office Action dated May 18, 2004 indicates that claims 1-20 have been withdrawn from prosecution. However, Applicant points out that the Examiner has never issued a restriction requirement with respect to these claims. Therefore, Applicant has not been given the opportunity to traverse any restriction requirement and it would be improper for these claims to be withdrawn from consideration without giving Applicant an opportunity to traverse the restriction resulting in the claims being withdrawn.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 and 8-20 are directed to the originally elected invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider, and not withdraw claims 1-7 and 11-20 from prosecution.

An Excess Claim Fee Payment Letter is submitted herewith to cover the cost of three (2) excess independent claims and seven (7) excess total claims.

Claims 1-7 and 11-30 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 8-10 have been canceled and claims 1, 5 and 16 have been amended to better define the invention. Claims 21-30 have been added to claim additional features of the invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected upon informalities (e.g., 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph). Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kern, "Handbook of Semiconductor wafer cleaning Technology". Claims 1-3 and 5-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,987,008). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Serial No. 09/935,699
Docket No. T36-135964M/KOH

8

Yamazaki et al. in view of Kern.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention, as recited in claim 21, is directed to a method for manufacturing a group III nitride compound semiconductor device. The method includes irradiating a surface of a wafer including a group III nitride compound semiconductor with ultraviolet rays to thereby clean a resist residue from the surface of the wafer.

Conventional methods use either chemical treatment or O₂ plasma treatment (plasma ashing) to remove contaminants from a wafer surface (Application at page 2, line 8-page 3, line 12). However, these processes increase a driving voltage of the light-emitting device or cause a leakage current (Application at page 3, line 13-16).

The claimed invention, on the other hand, irradiates the surface of the wafer including group III nitride compound semiconductor (e.g., after patterning a resist layer, after cutting a wafer, etc.) to clean a resist residue from a surface of the wafer. This feature is important for ensuring that the surface of the wafer is free of contaminants, such as an organic resist residue (e.g., after patterning the resist layer, cutting the wafer, etc.).

II. THE 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that claims 1-4 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicant submits that claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1-4 are not indefinite.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

A. The Kern Reference

The Examiner alleges that Kern teaches the claimed invention of claim 1. Applicant submits, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by Kern.

Serial No. 09/935,699
Docket No. T36-135964M/KOH

9

Kern discloses a ultraviolet (UV)/ozone cleaning method for cleaning semiconductor surfaces. Specifically, Kern discloses that UV light has the ability to depolymerize a variety of photoresist polymers (Kern at page 233, lines 19-20).

Applicant submits, however, that Kern does not teach or suggest *"irradiating a surface of a wafer comprising a group III nitride compound semiconductor with ultraviolet rays to thereby clean a resist residue from said surface of said wafer"*, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 5, 21, 25 and 28.

As explained in the present Application, unlike conventional methods for manufacturing a group III nitride compound semiconductor device which use either a chemical treatment or an O₂ plasma treatment to clean a surface of the device, the claimed invention irradiates the surface of the wafer including group III nitride compound semiconductor (e.g., after patterning a resist layer, after cutting a wafer, etc.) to clean a resist residue from a surface of the wafer (Application at Figure 2) This feature is important for ensuring that the surface of the wafer is free of contaminants, such as an organic resist residue (e.g., after patterning the resist layer, cutting the wafer, etc.).

For example, as shown in Figure 4 of the present Application, a patterned resist layer may include one or more windows. Thus, the surface of the wafer may be cleaned by irradiating the surface of the wafer through the window of the resist layer.

Clearly, these features are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Indeed, one object of the claimed method is to remove organic contaminations remaining after patterning a resist layer on a wafer including group III nitride compound semiconductor. However, nowhere does Kern even address this object of the claimed method.

In fact, Kern merely states that UV light has the capability of depolymerizing a variety of photoresist polymers on a silicon wafer. Kern discloses experiments that were conducted on "polished quartz wafers" (Kern at page 235, lines 11-12) and on an aluminum thin film (Kern at page 235, lines 25-26) and on silicon (Kern at page 252, lines 27-30). However, nowhere does Kern disclose or suggest a patterned resist layer, let alone irradiating a surface of a wafer having group III nitride compound semiconductor (e.g., after a resist layer has been patterned) to clean a surface of the wafer.

Therefore, the Kern method is completely different than the claimed invention which irradiates a surface of the wafer including group III nitride compound semiconductor (e.g.,

Serial No. 09/935,699
Docket No. T36-135964M/KOH

10

after patterning a resist layer) as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that there are elements of the claimed invention that are not taught or suggest by Kern. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

B. The Yamazaki et al. Reference

The Examiner alleges that Yamazaki et al. teaches the invention of claims 1-3 and 5-10 and would have been combined with Kern to form the invention of claim 4. Applicant submits, however, that Yamazaki does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, and that Yamazaki would not have been combined with Kern and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Yamazaki discloses a method of forming a film which is intended to avoid damage on the surface of semiconductor. The Yamazaki method includes generating an active halogen or active hydrogen by a photochemical reaction, and cleaning the surface of the semiconductor by removing oxide formed thereon by means of the active elements (Yamazaki at Abstract).

Applicant submits, however, that Yamazaki does not teach or suggest Applicant submits, however, that Kern does not teach or suggest *"irradiating a surface of a wafer comprising a group III nitride compound semiconductor with ultraviolet rays to thereby clean a resist residue from said surface of said wafer"*, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 5, 21, 25 and 28.

As noted above, unlike conventional methods for manufacturing a group III nitride compound, the claimed invention irradiates the surface of the wafer including group III nitride compound semiconductor (e.g., after patterning a resist layer, after cutting a wafer, etc.) to clean a resist residue from a surface of the wafer (Application at Figure 2) This feature is important for ensuring that the surface of the wafer is free of contaminants, such as an organic resist residue (e.g., after patterning the resist layer, cutting the wafer, etc.).

Clearly, these features are not taught or suggested by Yamazaki. Indeed, as noted above, Yamazaki is merely directed to removing oxides and dirt from a semiconductor surface (Yamazaki at col. 7, lines 10-67). That is, like Kern, nowhere does Yamazaki teach or suggest a patterned resist layer, let alone irradiating a surface of a wafer to remove a resist

Serial No. 09/935,699
Docket No. T36-135964M/KOH

11

residue (e.g., after a resist layer has been patterned).

Further, with respect to claim 4, the Examiner concedes that Yamazaki does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, but alleges that Kern makes up for the deficiencies of Yamazaki. Applicant submits, however, that these references would not have been combined and, even if combined the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

However, Applicant submits that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, these references are directed to different problems and solutions. Specifically, Yamazaki is directed to a method of removing oxide formations from a surface, whereas Kern is directed to depolymerization of polymers on a surface. Therefore, these references are completely unrelated, and no person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered combining these disparate references, absent impermissible hindsight.

Further, Applicant submits that the Examiner can point to no motivation or suggestion in the references to urge the combination as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the Examiner merely states that it would have been obvious to combine these references in order to remove impurities from p-type semiconductor layers. However, the Examiner's stated motivation to combine is completely unrelated to irradiating a surface of a wafer after patterning a resist layer and, therefore, is insufficient to support the alleged combination.

Moreover, Applicant submits that neither Yamazaki, nor Kern, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests *"irradiating a surface of a wafer comprising a group III nitride compound semiconductor with ultraviolet rays to thereby clean a resist residue from said surface of said wafer"* as recited in claim 1. Indeed, as noted above, nowhere does Kern disclose a patterned resist layer, let alone irradiating a surface of a wafer including a group III nitride compound semiconductor (e.g., after a resist layer has been patterned) to clean a resist residue from the surface. Therefore, Kern clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamazaki.

Therefore, Applicant submits that there are elements of the claimed invention that are not taught or suggest by Yamazaki, and that Yamazaki would not have been combined with Kern and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Serial No. 09/935,699
Docket No. T36-135964M/KOH

12


IV. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-7 and 11-30, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,


Date: 7/19/04

Phillip E. Miller, Esq.
Registration No. 46,060

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Amendment was filed by facsimile with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Examiner Michail Kornakov, Group Art Unit # 1746 at fax number (703) 872-9306 this 19th day of July, 2004.



Phillip E. Miller
Reg. No. 46,060